



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE VERBAL IN -TEO IN POLYBIUS

BY HAMILTON FORD ALLEN

The use of the verbal adjective in -τεο "from Homer to Aristotle, exclusive" has been studied and the results of that study have been published,¹ so that we have a sound basis for the examination of the use of this verbal in the κοινή as represented in Polybius. In view of the completeness of Bishop's treatment of the verbal, it will be enough if we present the results of our study of the use of the verbal in -τεο in Polybius and refer the reader to Bishop for comparison.

1. *Form.*—Polybius uses a verbal adjective in -τεο 153 times, formed from 70 different verbs, simple 39, compound 31 (B., p. 5). From 48 of these verbs a verbal is formed once, from 11 twice, from 2 three times, from 3 four times, from 1 (δίδωμι) 6 times, from 2 (τίθημι, χράομαι) 7 times, from 1 (ήγέομαι) 13 times, from 1 (είρω, ήγτέον) 15 times, from 1 (νομίζω) 17 times. Polybius is not peculiar in using the same verbal many times (B., p. 5). The verbal is formed from 46 ω-verbs, from 12 μαι-verbs and from 12 μι-verbs in which Polybius shows no decided preference for any one class as compared with the authors examined by B. (p. 4). Polybius does not form the verbal in any new way (B., pp. 3 f.).

2. *Use.*—In spite of the fact that the majority of the verbs from which Polybius forms verbal adjectives are used transitively a verbal used personally is found but once ὑποδεικτέος ἂν εἴη τρόπος 3. 36. 5. In view of the fact that Polybius has studiously avoided the personal use of the verbal, Goetzeler² ascribes this one occurrence to a scribal error and would emend accordingly. He thinks that Polybius uses the impersonal verbal in imitation of Latin, which, at the period at which he wrote, said: *oppugnandum est Athenas*; in support of this he quotes Draeger and Wölflin.

¹Charles Edward Bishop "The Greek Verbal in -τεο," *Am. Journ. Phil.* XX (1899), pp. 1-21, 121-38, 241-53, cited as B. in this article. For literature of the subject see B., p. 2, note.

²Ludovicus Goetzeler *De Polybii Elocutione* (Würzburg, 1887), pp. 29 f.

F. O. Hultsch, in his review¹ of Goetzeler's dissertation, opposes Goetzeler's view, since (1) it may well have happened that some cases of the personal use of the verbal were contained in the lost parts of Polybius, (2) if we examine the passages where a personal construction might have been used instead of the impersonal, of such passages Hultsch has a list of thirty, it will be found that the impersonal form is used "wenn der vom Verbum abhängige Begriff zu einer gewissen Wortfülle sich erweitert," (3) the personal use in 3. 36. 5 has a better sound and is more suitable than the impersonal.

To this we may add that the personal construction of the verbal, though it is found in all periods of the literature (B., pp. 10 f.), is very much less used than the impersonal (1:10 according to B. for all the literature examined by him), and its frequency of use varies greatly in the several authors. Some do not use it at all. And Draeger (*Hist. Syntax*, p. 822) whom Goetzeler quotes, says: "Der Nominativ des Gerundivs mit dem Begriff der Nothwendigkeit und im passiven Sinne steht schon oft im archaischen Latein." So we need not wonder that we find but one occurrence of the personal verbal in Polybius' history in its present fragmentary state. It is retained in the text by Schweighaeuser and Büttner-Wobst. In all other cases the verbal is neuter in gender. It is never compared and is always predicative.

In the proportion of direct to indirect discourse, 5:1, the use of Polybius is about that of Xenophon (B., p. 8).

The impersonal verb is used absolutely (B., p. 14) 12 times: *προσεκτέον* 1. 64. 2, *ὑπέρ* c. gen., cf. 9. 15. 12; 1. 50. 5, 80. 3; *κινδυνεύει* 4. 11. 7; *ἐύλαβη* 2. 49. 1, cf. 1. 14. 7; *πολεμῇ* 3. 15. 12, 20. 2; *ρή* 1. 64. 2, *ὑπέρ* c. gen., 3. 58. 4; 12. 25^a. 3, *περί* c. gen.; *διαληπ* 11. 25. 3, *περί* c. gen.; *νομισ* 3. 32. 1; *πολυπραγμονή* 9. 19. 5, *ἐκ* c. gen.; *στοχασ* 9. 15. 13, *ἐκ* c. gen.

The verbal is used 6 times with the genitive alone, and 15 times with the dative alone; quite a different proportion from that found by B. (p. 15).

The accusative of direct object (B., p. 18) of an impersonal verbal occurs 5 times of personal object, 21 times of thing object

¹ *Berl. phil. Wochenschrift* 1887, No. 37, col. 1142.

(masculine or feminine). The impersonal verbal is used with a neuter noun, pronoun, or participle with the article, in the singular 16 times, plural twice. Of course, the neuter noun, etc., may be called the subject of the verbal, but we can hardly think that the speaker made any close distinction between this usage and such as *ταύτης παρεσπονδημένης τοὺς αἰτίους ἐκδοτέον εἶναι σφίσι* 3. 21. 7, or *μακαριστέον τῶν προγεγονότων τινάς* 23. 12. 5, especially when we find such a use as *ῥητέον ἂν εἴη τὴν παρασκευὴν καὶ τὸ πλήθος τῆς δυνάμεως* 2. 24. 2, and *τῆς διαθέσεως μεγίστην μερίδα νομιστέον ἔθῃ μοχθηρὰ καὶ τροφὴν κακὴν* 1. 81. 10. These examples show that B. is right (p. 137) when he argues that, though the neuter noun, etc., may be the grammatical subject of the verbal, it is in reality the logical object. And they also show that, at least in the time of Polybius, (1) no distinction was made between neuter and gender words as subject and object, (2) that the impersonal verbal was not thought of as transitive-active when used with a gender accusative and personal-passive when used with a neuter, the nominative and accusative of which had the same form, and (3) that an infinitive (B., p. 131) is rather the object than the subject of a neuter verbal formed from a transitive verb.

With the impersonal verbal the accusative of thing and dative of person occur 10 times, the accusative and dative of thing once. Polybius does not use the accusative and genitive with the verbal.

With two accusatives the impersonal verbal is used 20 times, in each case one accusative being predicate. Still the line between two accusatives and O. O. cannot be surely drawn in each case, since several of the verbals taking two accusatives also take the O. O. construction (which occurs 26 times after a verbal).

A complementary infinitive is used with a verbal 6 times (B., pp. 130 f.).

The articular infinitive (B., pp. 132, 137) with the verbal is found but twice in Polybius, and if the statements above made regarding the objectivity of the colorless neuter with the impersonal verbal are correct, both of the articular infinitives must be considered accusative, the one 1. 62. 6 being the subject of *εἶναι*, the other 3. 4. 9 in apposition with *τοῦτο*, which is the subject of *εἶναι*.

With the verbal a *ῥη*-clause (B., p. 133) is used only in its causal sense 2. 60. 2; *ὥς* introducing O. O. is used once 6. 50. 2, since in 24. 14. 4 it is in apposition with *τοῦτο*; a participle in O. O. is found once 12. 8. 1; there is no occurrence of a *ὅπως*-clause (B., p. 134) depending on a verbal; an indirect question occurs twice 1. 5. 2; 2. 14. 3; there is one occurrence of a conditional relative clause 3. 112. 5.

The agent by whom the action stated in the verbal is to be performed is expressed but 21 times, though a verbal is used 153 times, so that the ratio of use to omission is about 1:7, a much lower ratio than that found by B. (p. 242). Of these 21 occurrences of the expressed agent 11 are dative and 10 accusative. The agent is expressed by the dative of a personal pronoun in 3 passages, 1. 64. 2; 3. 21. 7; 15. 7. 3, where more than one group of persons is mentioned and the pronoun is necessary for the sake of clearness. In 3 passages the agent is expressed by a noun in the dative in all of which it would be impossible to omit it, and in 5 passages by a participle with the article in the plural. In 1. 35. 9 the dative participle without the article is a dative of relation or subjective dative (Kühner, 423, 18e).

By a construction which is peculiar to the Attic dialect the agent may be expressed by the accusative (B., pp. 242 ff.). In Polybius we find that this accusative-agent is used in 10 passages, while the dative-agent, which, considering B.'s figures, we might expect to find much more frequently used, occurs in but 11 passages. But in Polybius we nowhere find this accusative-agent expressed by a noun or pronoun. It is always a participle with or without the article. The accusative participle *without* the article is found in the plural 1. 14. 8; 3. 58. 4 (5 participles); 4. 41. 8; 12. 8. 1; 24. 14. 4; 35. 2. 10; in the singular 8. 1. 4; *with* the article in the plural 4. 27. 8, cf. 1. 13. 13; 2. 2. 2, where the same participle is dative, 5. 32. 5 (2 participles, cf. 1. 64. 2); 5. 98. 9. With the exception of 1. 14. 8, all of these cases are found later than the five occurrences of the dative participle.

The reason for using the accusative-agent in place of the dative cannot depend on nearness to or remoteness from the verbal; for the accusative-agent stands next to the verbal as well as widely

removed from it. Nor can it depend on actual or incipient O. O., though in 12. 8. 1; 24. 14. 4; 35. 2. 10 it might possibly be considered as due to this cause. For an explanation we must rather look to B. as cited above. In no case in Polybius are the dative and accusative-agent found side by side, though such a use is cited by Kühner (427, n. 2), and yet not with one and the same verbal.

As to the use of the copula when the accusative-agent is employed, Kühner (427, n. 2) says: "Der Indikativ *ἐστί* wird hier regelmässig weggelassen." Polybius omits the copula in 8 cases out of 10, using it but twice, *εἶναι*, in O. O. (B. 247). Otherwise the use is as follows: *ἐστί* 7 times, twice in statements of facts, 5 times in O. O.; *εἶναι* 4 times in O. O.; *εἴη* 5 times in O. O.; *ἂν εἴη* potential 9 times; *ἦν* once in the protasis of a simple past condition; in all 26 times, making the ratio of use to omission 1:5. The copula stands (B., pp. 252 f.) 21 times after the verbal to 5 times before it and is never separated from the verbal by more than one word.

The negative used with the verbal is always *οὐ* or some compound form of it (B., p. 9).

According to Kühner 427, n. 2 end, the verbal construction sometimes passes over to the infinitive and two examples are cited. In the former of these the change to the infinitive may be due to *δεῖ* intervening between the verbal and the infinitive. And in any given case, even though *δεῖ* does not occur, the change is probably due to the effect of *δεῖ* implied in the preceding verbal. This change, which is not mentioned by B., is found once in Polybius *δῆλον ὡς οὔτε* (15 words) *νομιστέον, οὔτε* (16 words) *οἰεσθαι* 18. 13. 4.

The so-called philosophic use (B., pp. 7, 137 f.) of the verbal with the article does not occur in Polybius.

Polybius does not overwork the verbal construction, using it but 153 times in 1,369 Teubner pages. Nor does he pile up one verbal upon another, like Xenophon, for example, who, *Mem.* 2. 1. 28, uses 10 verbals in a space of 14 lines. Four is the the largest number of verbals which Polybius uses without intervening expressions of necessity or obligation.